



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,992	12/27/2005	Feng Jun Guo	CS22937SC	4072

20280 7590 01/19/2007
MOTOROLA INC
600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45
ROOM AS437
LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343

EXAMINER

BROOKS, SHANNON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/562,992

Applicant(s)

GUO ET AL.

Examiner

Shannon R. Brooks

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 10/30/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
3. **Claims 1-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellin (US 6683526 B2) in view of Vanska (US 7072672 B1).

Consider **Claims 1 and 11**, Bellin clearly teaches and discloses a method for selectively deleting messages received by a radio telephone, the method being effected by the telephone and the

method comprising: detecting at the telephone (**read as method also applies to a telephone**)(Col. 16, lines 18-27) when the telephone has moved from a previous coverage area to a current coverage area (**read as over-the-air registration**) (Col. 12, lines 67-68, Col. 13, lines 1-10) and Col. 14, lines 47-57); selectively accessing a set of coverage area specific messages, received when the telephone was in the previous area and stored in a memory of the telephone (Col. 14, lines 47-59) in response to said detecting, ; and automatically deleting the coverage area specific messages from the memory based on a time trigger(Col. 13, lines 20-32) except that it does not specifically teach automatically deleting in response to said detecting. However, Vanska teaches automatically deleting in response to said detecting (Col. 1, lines 31-40, Col. 3, lines 22-41, Col. 4, lines 11-14, and Col. 5, lines 19-29, where Vanska discusses a **location trigger**). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Vanska into Bellin to aid in deletions based on trigger parameters associated with a location (**Abstract**).

Consider **Claims 2 and 12**, Bellin clearly teaches and discloses a method for selectively deleting messages, wherein the selectively obtaining is effected by only selecting messages that are presumed to be generic messages (**read as group specific**)(Col.2, lines 55-58) sent by a service provider of the previous coverage area.

Consider **Claims 3 and 13**, Bellin clearly teaches and discloses a method for selectively deleting messages, wherein the selectively obtaining is effected by only selecting messages sent from one or more telephone numbers that do not correspond with any numbers stored in a telephone book database of known personal numbers (**read as group numbers**)(Col. 6, lines 22-37), inserted by a user, that are identifiable by the telephone.

Consider **Claims 4 and 14**, Bellin clearly teaches and discloses a method for selectively deleting messages, wherein the selectively obtaining is effected by only selecting messages that have a content presumed to include generic advertising (**read as a standard industrial classification**)(Col. 11, line 63).

Consider **Claims 5 and 15**, Bellin clearly teaches and discloses a method for selectively deleting messages, wherein the content may be presumed to include generic advertising by searching each of the messages for selected words (**read as character string**) (Col. 13, lines 46-56).

Consider **Claim 6 and 16**, Bellin clearly teaches and discloses a method for selectively deleting messages, wherein selectively obtaining may include requesting confirmation (**read as send messages back**) (Col. 16, line 42) from a user that a message is one of the coverage area specific messages (read as confirmation of latitude and longitude coordinates) (Col. 13, lines 39-44).

Consider **Claim 7**, Bellin clearly teaches and discloses a method for selectively deleting messages, wherein the obtaining is effected after arrival of the telephone at the current coverage area (**read as after over-the-air registration**)(Col. 12, lines 67-68 and Col. 13, lines 1-10).

Consider **Claim 8**, Bellin clearly teaches and discloses a method for selectively deleting messages (**read as containing a character string in the control portion**), wherein the obtaining is effected before the telephone leaves the previous coverage area (**read as a roving receiver capable of receiving localized messages**) (Col. 14, line 48).

Consider **Claim 9**, Bellin clearly teaches and discloses a method for selectively deleting messages, wherein the detecting is characterized by detecting that the telephone has moved from the previous coverage area to the current coverage area (**read as a roving receiver capable of**

Art Unit: 2617

receiving localized messages (Col. 14, line 48) when there is a change in a service provider (read as not in the selected area)(Col. 12, lines 31-43) cell communicating with the telephone (Col. 12, lines 16-30).

Consider Claims 10 and 18, Bellin clearly teaches and discloses a method for selectively deleting messages, wherein the detecting is characterized by detecting that the telephone has moved from the previous coverage area to the current coverage area (read as not in the selected area)(Col. 12, lines 31-43) when the telephone moves from one cell to another cell (read as a roving receiver capable of receiving localized messages (Col. 14, line

Consider Claim 17, Bellin teaches a method for selectively deleting messages, further including the step of detecting a change in a service provider cell communicating with the telephone (read as GPS has detected a location change)(Col.14, lines 47-59), and responsive thereto detecting that the telephone has moved from the previous coverage area to the current coverage area when there is a change in a service provider cell communicating with the telephone (Col. 14, lines 47-59).

Consider Claim 19, Bellin teaches a radio telephone (read as not limited to paging system)(Col. 16, lines 18-27), comprising:

a receiver (Fig. 20, Block 684); a memory for storing messages received by the receiver (Fig. 20, Block 690); and a controller coupled to the memory and the receiver (Fig. 20, Block 688), the controller (read as appropriate circuitry) detecting at the telephone that the telephone has moved from a previous coverage area to a current coverage area (Col. 14, lines 47-59), and automatically deleting, by the telephone and from the memory associated with the telephone, coverage area specific messages received when the telephone was in the previous coverage area

(Col.13, lines 20-32), except that it does not specifically teach automatic deleting in response to said detecting that the telephone has moved from the previous coverage area to the current coverage area. However, Vanska teaches automatically deleting in response to said detecting (Col. 1, lines 31-40, Col. 3, lines 22-41, Col. 4, lines 11-14, and Col. 5, lines 19-29, where Vanska discusses a location trigger). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Vanska into Bellin to aid in deletions based on trigger parameters associated with a location (**Abstract**).

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shannon R. Brooks whose telephone number is (571) 270-1115. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30a.m. to 5p.m..

Art Unit: 2617

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Corsaro can be reached on (571) 272-7876. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shannon Brooks
January 8, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nick Corsaro". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

NICK CORSARO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600